Mark Lane, Empathy, WWDC

Says the committee is being killed. Question is it killing itself.

He attributes to "one of the most effective campaigns by the intelligence community."
It is "their counter-attack against this investigation."

The "three people in the media" who have done all of this, most impa, Burnham, O'Leary and Lardner. "They are certainly activists."

Accuses Burnham of "creating news" and says there are no real questions about Sprague's background. In fact is all was published earlier in Phila. papers. Burnham said less, omitting the ACLU's criticism of Sprague for a lack of concern for legal and Constitutional rights.

"They have not told the truth and they have not raised serious questions." My own about conflict of interest go back to the day he was appointed.

Lardner in N.O. On Shaw "We now have documents from the CIA under the FOIA" that prove it. I published it in 1967.

"The last person to see David Ferrie die, though he never was indicted....was George Lardner. He's sort of been an activist." Campaign to allege that Lardner assassinated Ferrie by Lane's associates AIB, Cutler, etc.

Objects to the Post and Lardner not reporting his speech in Dellums office.

"Yet in today's New York (sic) Post Lardner quotes in full a man named Harold Weisberg, who is a critic of the Warren commission of sorts—"

I was not quoted in full.

Fisk, "Who is he?" Lane,"Why is Weisberg quoted...I don't care of Lardner quotes me..."
He did when Lane claimed Sprague owe his job to Lane.

It is only when Lardner wants to attack Sprague that he goes out of his way to look me up. I'll stand on every word I said. Lardner has known me for a decade.

He also says I attack the concept of the committee. This is an overt lie. Mine is the first book to ask for a Congressional investigation and I've spent hours with this one, which is a large part of the cause of my criticisms of it.

Pretends that Lardner has "set me up" an an authority. Not only have I done more, published more and continued with it when Mark was commercializing and when he copped out but the DJ had certified that I, not he, know more about the case than anyone in the FBI.

Says "he will not makes the mistakes the Warren Commission made." He begins with it, by presumptions of guilt in both cases, by leaking it prejudicially and dishinestly and by including it in the report.

He says he has spent 13 years looking into the JFK assassination. He has not. He did not do all the work in his own forst book, once it was out went around making speeches instead or working and when he had milked the campuses developed other interests until suddenly this became a popular cause he could latch onto again. Tell the story of the blacks in New Orleans and the rental cars.

Fisk: the objections are to the nature and cost of the investigation. True. Lane equates this to the cost of building a garage. If relevant this does not address the nature. Nor does he do more than repeat Sprague in referring to the cost of looking for Pattie Hearst. Same with costs of Warren Commission. This does not address the legitimacy of the 13 million, its need or how it would be spent.

Go into budget- smallest item for witnesses.

Fisk is right in saying "wuthout knowing" in relationship to their expenditures, including junkets. And in this Lane has gotten away from the

Even the reference to the Congress not exercising overseight and not being able to get records is phoney. He did not say what real effort it made. It passes laws. Why did it not pass a law if it wanted access to these FBI records? Why does it not sue the FBI, as I do and Lane does not? I get records. And I have already bequeathed them to the public.

Fisk is right in saying the Congress has not enacted the laws to enable.

Hosty letter- Lane implies first knowledge before Edwards committee. Tell story. Include Hosty's destruction of all records and who knew.

When Oswald was questioned "the agents said 'Oh, we forgot to use a tape recorder.'" Goes into absence of stenos. This is not the account of tape recorders and the business of no transcript comes from my work, not his.

"Took me two years to find a publisher" for his first book, which he pretends he had written two years earlier. Both are false. He began with a pugblisher and did not meet his contractual obligations. He had not written it then as he says in his own second book.

"5000 citations and references." Example, the first 10 are all one. Some are to non-existing sources. Liebeler and the liar charge.

In fact he had given up and a young woman with more guts than he had arranged for the publication without his referring to her in it or the paper to which he was indebted that had been edited by her father.

"I think that the campaign to attack this committee... has been orchestrated by the intelligence organizations of this country." He?

Lane says that the PSE should be used after people testify - endorses the device when the ACLU takes the opposite position. What is wrong with the human mind in evalutaing trust, or fact, except fpr those like Lane who do no original work. He even lies about Sprague "nothing thinking of buying one." His budget had provision for two. tell about results of PSE's on this subject.

Says he did not attack me in response to first question.

Then, "I wrote the original screen play for the film Executive Action." It comes from Farewell America. Even oriricises the late Dalton Trumbo because their script had to be rewritten. In fact they were thrown off the set.

"It is basically somewhat fanciful the work that Harold has been involved in."

"The Washington Post will utilize...anyone to attack the formation of the cOmmittee." I did not attack the formation of the committee. My book was the first for it, not his.

"Weisberg I believe is not a sincere critic of the Warren Commission." The reason is because I will not say that wrong is right because it serves Mark's commercial purposes.

My approach is "disruptive and takes us off the basic questions." Only because I do not support "this investigation." Tick off the jackassery - the FBI leak, the CIA leak, the Ray in Portugal bull and the leaking of my own work to Anderson as the committee's own work. Use Milteer as example. This is not what I want of my Congress, if it is the career of a professional plagiarist, Lane. He says what I told Lardner is "for the purpose of undermining the work of those who want this committee to continue."

Lane has faith in Gonzales' preconceptions on both Ray and Oswald, Connally's clothes, Weberman.

"If given the subpoena power." What did thegy do with it when they had it? They didn't even take subpoenaes when they went to Memphis and then led the members of the committee to believe that what I gave them the prosecutor, who had refused all records, had given.

He rfused to debate me saying "I would sooner have a discussion in a mental institutio He'd be better off doing it but I think the station ought have made some comment. So let

Here is where to show the Freep. Tell about BBC and not a farthing. And say the illustrations are legion. Invented footnotes to nonexistent sources.

He says he'd be happy to meet with Gardner and Leary.

"What have I said" about what the papers said. Use my quotes.

Criticizes statements of opinion in signed articles. This is one of the functions of signed articles, traditionally. And I am not their apologist. The Post has never reviewed any of my books and never said a good word about me. In fact they bowed to Lane's blackmail threat to sue them when I said he is less than honest.

He says it is unfair for Gardner to quote me. Why did he not say he quoted Lane? Get and use his quotation of Lane on Sprague. He said Gardner quotes no others.

He says the committee's side not used. Post on Kessler and Goshko stories and the tremenduous play they got, whole front page one Chicago paper in November.

"We represent" the American people. In lies? Leaks? Prejudgements without investigations?

I think I represent the American people in wanting truth and honesty and in not wanting their Congress imposed upon by the ripoff artists like Lane who has parlayed this into what is reported as a six-figure deal.

The caller who said "you threw the baby out with the bathwater" is right." He is right in calling Lane "Diamonf Jim Brady." But to this point he has not pointed out a single e error in anything I said.

When Downing retired "there was no chairman." There is succession by seniority, as when tere is death, to continue functions.

Can Mark still pretend Gonzales was then for Sprague.

Says the reason he would not take counsel's job is he felt it was wrong. Not his six-figure deal?

Says this committee has not made the mistakes of the Commission with the FBI. Instead it hired DJ lawyers, who are above investigators and direct them.

After he booby-trapped the trusting committee- the unchecking committee - into believing that the Memphis police had destroyed their King files he now says that "all ~~180~~ 180 boxes" he describes as on King surveillance were destroyed. He knew this was a lie before this broadcast and the fact is the Memphis authorities had not destroyed their King files. This lie of his, uncritically repeated by the committee and then defended by Sprague is one of t he reasons for deepest doubt about this committee. He says the committee needs subpoena power to prevent this but they heald hearings without issuing a single ~~xxxxxxxx~~ subpoena. Even after they discussed with me in ~~September~~ October what subpoenaes to issue on who they had not done this ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ a month later. Why did he not tell you why this committee and Sprague did not issue subpoenaes promptly and now claim they have to be continued to issue them belatedly?

Asked can we use the FBI in some way he talks about their "track record." What is wrong with sunpoenaeing their agents and getting their records? I'm deppsing some and I'm not a committee and have no tax money - or any support from the Lanes and other commercializers.

(Not to use- at about 15 on side 3 he says that Hoover turned the entire King assassination over the the SAC Atlanta who then turned it over to the "get King" squad."The same squad which for years had tried to destroy Dr. King.)

"I never speculate about who was involved or what the motive was." Here use Freep. And what he said when Shaw was indicted. "I deal with just facts."

(Almost 60 goes to Memphis with Abby Mann. Said Dr. King was a friend of his ans asked Mark to meet him there. Ot this Mark says "And the material I discovered in those three days is what I wrote about it is that article (Newsworks). And when - as soon as we discovered this evidebce we went to see Coretta King in Atlanta and gave her the information and then I came back to Washington and sahred it with some of the members of the black caucus. First one was Andy Young. ... and with Walter Fauntroy ...Yvonne Burke ... and they arranged a meeting which has not been much talked about in the press but Coretta King came to Washington to meet with Tip O'Neill, who is now the speaker, and with Carl Albert" and asked for the investigation. ...And now we've seen a very serious attack orchestrated upon the committee and upon its counsel. It is my own belief" that anyone in Sprague's position would be attacked. By me? (end side 3)

Legislative purpose - where was Lane in the original resolution - my history on this. 1975

Says Sprague is cautious. Mexico? Memphis? Portugal? Ray and Oswald the assassins? Not even the immediate serving of subpoenas? This is being cautious?

Goes into Executive Action as "a fiction film based upon hard fact." How about the book? "Everything in the film was based upon hard fact. ..." Everything in the film not his but good but in spite of this it is a big success. Lamarre, Steve Jaffe.

Asked about his appearance on the Merv Griffin show he says it was live in DC"What had happened is that several weeks before then Robert Kennedy had sent an emissary to Jim Garrison in New Orleans. And the emissary said that Robert Kennedy wants you to know that he supports your investigation into the assassination of his brother. and if he is elected President he will blow the thing sky-high, he will find out who killed his brother...but he cannot say anything now because there are guns between him and the White House." He has embellished this total falsehood not to include a second emissary with the message that "if he wins that last major primary in California he may very well break it that night." Now I had known about that for some weeks" He did not talk about it because he felt he had to be secret. He says it was with Jack Anderson in the audience. And asked Robert's position he said that with the primary over "I think I can tell you." So he says he then told the story. It is 100% phoney, as Garrison said.

Says Sibert-O'Neill report was a top-secret document. It was never classified.

He says, falsely, that Frascier did ballistics tests in fragments the size of pinhead.

"The bullet was removed from Dr. King's body, intact. Mushroomed at the top but intact." He then says that some Frazier said this was not sufficiently intact to determine. First of all this ism not true in any part. Frazier spoke of deformity and mulitation. Second of all it is my work he is in the habit of stealing. I had to file a lawsuit against the

DJ ~~xxx~~ to get that ~~xx~~ record.

ends at 50.